



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/644,967	08/21/2003	David A. Matthews	003797.01880	7579
28319 7590 08/23/2007 BANNER & WITCOFF, LTD. ATTORNEYS FOR CLIENT NOS. 003797 & 013797 1100 13th STREET, N.W. SUITE 1200 WASHINGTON, DC 20005-4051			EXAMINER TRAN, TUYETLIEN T	
			ART UNIT - 2179	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 08/23/2007	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/644,967

Applicant(s)

MATTHEWS ET AL.

Examiner

TuyetLien (Lien) T. Tran

Art Unit

2179

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 21 June 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-7 and 9-36 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-7 and 9-36 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to the following communication: Amendment filed 06/21/07.

This action is made final.

2. Claims 1-7 and 9-36 are pending in the case. Claims 1, 14, 25 and 31 are independent claims. Claims 1-4, 6, 11-14, 18, 22, 24, 25, 27, 29-32 and 36 are amended claims.

Response to Amendment

3. Applicant's amendment corrects the previous objection on specification and therefore the objection is withdrawn.

4. Applicant's amendment corrects the previous rejection under 35 U.S.C 112, first paragraph and therefore the rejection is withdrawn.

5. Applicant's amendment corrects the previous rejection under 35 U.S.C 101 and therefore the rejection is withdrawn.

6. The Declaration and Exhibits filed on 6/21/07 under 37 CFR 1.131 have been considered but is ineffective to overcome the applied reference (<http://web.archive.org/web/20030803040103/http://www.desktopsidebar.com/>; Desktop Sidebar).

The evidence submitted is insufficient to establish a reduction to practice of the invention in this country or a NAFTA or WTO member country prior to the effective date of the Desktop Sidebar reference. see MPEP 715. It appears that the applicants try to establish a reduction to practice of the invention prior or on 08/04/2003 (e.g., see Applicant's Declaration page 3, item 9, lines 1-5); however, the support document, "a draft application" is not provided. Therefore, the

Art Unit: 2179

examiner cannot determine the scope of the support document and the complete application filed on 8/21/03.

The evidence submitted is insufficient to establish a conception of the invention prior to the effective date of the Desktop Sidebar reference. While conception is the mental part of the inventive act, it must be capable of proof, such as by demonstrative evidence or by a complete disclosure to another. Conception is more than a vague idea of how to solve a problem. The requisite means themselves and their interaction must also be comprehended. See *Mergenthaler v. Scudder*, 1897 C.D. 724, 81 O.G. 1417 (D.C. Cir. 1897). In Declaration under Declaration under 37 C.F.R. 1.131 filed 6/21/07, page 2, it appears that the applicants try to establish a conception of the invention prior to the effective date of the Desktop Sidebar reference. However, the applicants fail to provide mapping in detail between the support document and each limitations of the claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

7. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

8. Claim 31 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 31 recites the limitation "the selected interactive features" in line 8 of the claim.

There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

9. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

Art Unit: 2179

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent.

10. Claims 1-5, 9-13, 24-28, 30-34, and 36 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being anticipated by Desktop Sidebar v. 1.03 (printed web pages from desktopsidebar, published on 08/03/2003 pages 1-4; hereinafter sidebar103).

As to claim 1, sidebar103 teaches:

A method in a computing system for providing a user interaction scheme (e.g., Desktop Sidebar v.1.03, see page 1) comprising:

minimizing an application upon receiving a minimize command (e.g., minimized Windows Media Player, see page 2 paragraph 10); and

revealing a tile in a sidebar to represent the minimized application in response to the minimize command (e.g., Media Player panel as shown in Fig. 4),

the sidebar configured to display a plurality of tiles corresponding to a plurality of applications (e.g., see Fig. 4), wherein revealing the title includes;

displaying one or more interactive application features of the minimized application in the tile (e.g., allows you to control Windows Media Player through panel, see page 2 paragraph 10).

As to claim 25, sidebar103 teaches:

A system for providing user access to a variety of informational items (e.g., Desktop Sidebar v.1.03, see page 1), the system comprising:

a processor for generating sidebar for displaying a plurality of tiles (e.g., sidebar that contains a plurality of panels, see page 2 paragraphs 4 and 5; note that it is well-known feature that a computer system comprises a processor for executing programming instruction);

Art Unit: 2179

at least one application including an insertion module for inserting a tile into the sidebar (e.g., panels are freely arranged, added, removed, moved, and grouped, see page 1 paragraph 6), wherein one or more selected interactive features of the application displayed in the tile when the application is represented by the tile in the sidebar (e.g., see page 2 paragraph 10); and

user interface tools for allowing a user to command placement of a selected application into the sidebar (e.g., panels can be added or moved, see page 1 paragraph 6).

As to claim 31, sidebar103 teaches:

A system for providing access to a minimized application through a user interface (e.g., Desktop Sidebar v.1.03, see page 1), the system comprising:

a processor (note that it is well-known feature that a computer system comprises a processor for executing programming instruction);

an available feature selection module for allowing an application to provide one or more selected interactive features of the application including at least a sub-set of a full feature set upon minimization of the application (e.g., see page 2 paragraph 10); and

a tile insertion module for revealing a tile corresponding to the application upon minimization and for displaying the selected interactive features in the tile in response to minimization (e.g., see page 1, 'Mail Checker Window' image).

As to claim 2, sidebar103 further teaches wherein the one or more interactive application features include a sub-set of the original application features (e.g., see page 2 paragraph 10).

As to claim 3, sidebar103 further teaches wherein the one or more interactive application features include all of the original application features (e.g., mail checker window, see page 1, 'Mail Checker Window' image).

As to claim 4, sidebar103 teaches further comprising providing, in the tile, access to additional features not available in the application (e.g., providing a feature of removing, adding, grouping the tiles together, see page 1, paragraph 6).

As to claim 5, sidebar103 teaches further comprising hiding an application window upon receiving the minimize command (e.g., hiding Windows Media Player, see page 2 paragraph 10).

As to claims 9, 30, and 36, sidebar103 teaches comprising providing access to the subset of application features through a fly-out menu accessible displayed in the tile (e.g., see page 1, 'Mail Checker Window' image).

As to claims 10, 26 and 33, sidebar103 teaches comprising providing the user with a restore button accessible through the tile to allow the user to maximize the application (e.g., allowing to restore weather page, see screenshot of Weather Panel on page 3 and better version on page 4).

As to claims 11 and 27, sidebar103 teaches further comprising providing an available features selection module for allowing selection of the one or more interactive features for display in and accessibility through the tile (e.g., see page 2 paragraph 10).

As to claim 12, sidebar103 teaches further comprising allowing the user to determine a size of the tile (e.g., see page 1 paragraph 6).

As to claims 13 and 24, sidebar103 further teaches a computer storage medium having computer executable instructions for performing the method of claim 1 and claim 12 (e.g., desktop sidebar is installed on a desktop).

As to claims 28 and 34, sidebar103 teaches further comprising special controls for allowing removal of the application from the sidebar (e.g., panels can be removed, see page 1 paragraph 6).

As to claim 32, sidebar103 teaches wherein the tile insertion module reveals a tile in a sidebar configured to host the tile within the user interface, wherein the sidebar includes a plurality of tiles corresponding to a plurality of applications (e.g., sidebar that contains a plurality of panels, see page 2 paragraphs 4 and 5).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

11. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

12. **Claims 14-17 and 20-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over sidebar103 in view of Amro et al (Patent No. US 6335745 B1; hereinafter Amro).**

Art Unit: 2179

As to claim 14, sidebar103 teaches:

A method in a computing system for providing a user interaction scheme through the use of a sidebar (e.g., Desktop Sidebar v.1.03, see page 1), comprising:

moving an application to the sidebar upon receipt of a command to minimize the application (e.g., minimized Windows Media Player, see page 2 paragraph 10); and

displaying, without user interaction other than the user command, at least a sub-set of interactive features belonging to the application in the minimized application in the sidebar (e.g., allows you to control Windows Media Player through panel, see page 2 paragraph 10; note that the minimized application in the sidebar is displayed automatically in response to a command to minimize the application, see Fig. 4).

Sidebar103 does not expressly teach moving an application to the sidebar upon receipt of a user command to minimize the application.

However, Amro teaches moving an application to the sidebar upon receipt of a user command to minimize the application (e.g., Application A is moved to active application bar 106 as shown in Fig. 5). Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include the feature of moving an application to the sidebar upon receipt of a user command to minimize the application as taught by Amro to the sidebar application as taught by sidebar103 to achieve the claimed invention. The motivation for the combination is to provide a user with instant access to some of the most important daily information (e.g., see sidebar103 page 1, paragraph 2).

As to claim 16, sidebar103 teaches further comprising inserting a tile in the sidebar for providing access to the application (e.g., panels can be added or moved, see page 1 paragraph 6).

As to claims 15, 17, 20, 21, 22, 23, claims 15, 17, 20, 21, 22, 23 are in the same context as claim 4, 5, 9, 10, 11, 12 respectively; therefore they are rejected under similar rationale.

13. Claims 6 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over sidebar103.

As to claims 6 and 18, sidebar103 teaches the limitation of claims 1 and 14 for the reasons as discussed with respect to claims 1 and 14 above. Sidebar103 fails to expressly teach hiding taskbar application button associated with the application. However, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made to implement this feature because sidebar103 suggests to the skill artisan that the desktop sidebar as taught by sidebar103 provides a user with instant access to some of the most important daily information (e.g., see sidebar103 page 1, paragraph 2). Therefore, hiding taskbar application button associated with the application would be desirable because a user can access to one or more feature of the minimized application through the tile (e.g., see sidebar103 page 4). The motivation is to providing more space for display area.

14. Claims 7 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over sidebar103 in view of Kramer et al (Patent No US 6738810 B1, hereinafter Kramer).

As to claims 7 and 19, sidebar103 teaches the limitation of claims 1 and 14 for the reasons as discussed with respect to claims 1 and 14 above. However, sidebar103 fails to expressly teach hiding an alt-tab entry associated with the application. Kramer, though, teaches hiding an alt-tab entry associated with the application (e.g., see col. 7 lines 19-36).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of sidebar103 and Kramer before him at the time the invention was made to have combined the two teachings together to automatically hide the alt-tab entry associated with the application upon receiving the minimized command because features associated with the application is now available through the tile in the sidebar; therefore, disabling or hiding the alt-tab entry would save memory and thus speed up processing time.

15. Claims 29 and 35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over sidebar103 in view of Kramer.

As to claims 29 and 35, sidebar103 teaches the limitation of claims 25 and 31 for the reasons as discussed with respect to claims 25 and 31 above. Sidebar103 further teaches hiding an application window upon receiving the minimize command (e.g., hiding Windows Media Player, see page 2 paragraph 10). However, sidebar103 fails to expressly teach a taskbar application button associated with the application upon receiving the minimized command. However, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made to implement this feature because sidebar103 suggests to the skill artisan that the desktop sidebar as taught by sidebar103 provides a user with instant access to some of the most important daily information (e.g., see sidebar103 page 1, paragraph 2). Therefore, hiding taskbar application button associated with the application would be desirable because a user can access to one or more feature of the minimized application through the tile (e.g., see sidebar103 page 4). The motivation is the same as discussed with respect to claims 6 and 18 above. Sidebar103 still do not teach hiding an alt-tab entry associated with the application. Kramer, though, teaches hiding an alt-tab entry associated with the application

Art Unit: 2179

(e.g., see col. 7 lines 19-36). Thus, combining sidebar103 and Kramer would meet the limitations for the same reasons as discussed with respect to claims 7 and 19 above.

16. Claims 1-6, 9-11, 13-18, 20-22, 25-28, 30-34, and 36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Amro et al (Patent No. US 6335745 B1; hereinafter Amro) in view of Straub et al (Patent No US 6216141 B1; hereinafter Straub).

As to claim 1, Amro teaches:

A method in a computing system for providing a user interaction scheme (e.g., see Fig. 6) comprising:

minimizing an application upon receiving a minimize command (e.g., minimized application A and B as shown in Fig. 5); and

revealing a tile in a desktop bar to represent the minimized application in response to the minimize command (e.g., 'Application A' tile in Fig. 5), the desktop bar configured to display a plurality of tiles corresponding to a plurality of applications (e.g., note "Application A" and "Application B" , wherein revealing the title includes;

Amro further teaches providing access to one or more application features through the tile (e.g., providing access to application A's menu bar and toolbar, see Fig. 6). However, Amro does not expressly teach a sidebar and displaying one or more interactive application features of the minimized application in the tile.

Straub, though, teaches a sidebar having a plurality of tiles for displaying a plurality of interactive information (e.g., items 156, 158, 160 in a channel bar 144 as shown in Fig. 5) and displaying one or more interactive features of the minimized application in the tile (e.g., note that the tile comprising interactive information such as buttons 156, 158, 160 as shown in Fig. 5 and col. 8 lines 15-67). Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one skill in the art at the time the

Art Unit: 2179

invention was made to include the feature of a sidebar having a plurality of tiles for displaying a plurality of interactive information as taught by Straub to the user interface as taught by Amro to achieve the claimed invention. The motivation for the combination is to provide a user with instant access to some of the most important daily information (e.g., see sidebar103 page 1, paragraph 2).

As to claim 14, Amro teaches:

A method in a computing system for providing a user interaction scheme through the use of a desktop bar (e.g., see Fig. 6), comprising:

moving an application to the sidebar upon receipt of a command to minimize the application (e.g., Application A is moved to active application bar 106 as shown in Fig. 5); and

Amro further teaches providing access to one or more application features through the tile (e.g., providing access to application A's menu bar and toolbar, see Fig. 6). However, Amro does not expressly teach a sidebar and displaying, without user interaction other than the user command, at least a sub-set of interactive features belonging to the application in the minimized application in the sidebar.

Straub, though, teaches a sidebar having a plurality of tiles for displaying a plurality of interactive information (e.g., items 156, 158, 160 in a channel bar 144 as shown in Fig. 5) and displaying one or more interactive features of the minimized application in the tile (e.g., note that the tile comprising interactive information such as buttons 156, 158, 160 as shown in Fig. 5 and col. 8 lines 15-67). Thus, combining Amro and Straub would meet the claimed limitations for the same reasons as discussed with respect to claim 1 above.

As to claim 25, Amro teaches:

A system for providing user access to a variety of informational items (e.g., see Fig. 6), the system comprising:

a processor for generating desktop bar for displaying a plurality of tiles (e.g., see Fig. 1, Fig. 2 and Fig. 5);

at least one application including an insertion module for inserting a tile into the desktop bar (e.g., inserting 'Application A' into the bar 106, see Fig. 6);

user interface tools for allowing a user to command placement of a selected application into the desktop bar (e.g., clicking one of the buttons 120, 122, 124, see Fig. 4).

Amro further teaches providing access to one or more application features through the tile (e.g., providing access to application A's menu bar and toolbar, see Fig. 6). However, Amro does not expressly teach a sidebar and displaying in the tile one or more selected interactive features of the application.

Straub, though, teaches a sidebar having a plurality of tiles for displaying a plurality of interactive information (e.g., items 156, 158, 160 in a channel bar 144 as shown in Fig. 5) and displaying one or more interactive features of the minimized application in the tile (e.g., note that the tile comprising interactive information such as buttons 156, 158, 160 as shown in Fig. 5 and col. 8 lines 15-67). Thus, combining Amro and Straub would meet the claimed limitations for the same reasons as discussed with respect to claim 1 above.

As to claim 31, Amro teaches:

A system for providing access to a minimized application through a user interface (e.g., see Fig. 6), the system comprising:

a processor (e.g., see Figs. 1, 2);

an available feature selection module for allowing an application to provide one or more selected interactive features of the application including at least a sub-set of a full feature set

Art Unit: 2179

upon minimization of the application (e.g., providing access to application A's menu bar and toolbar, see Fig. 6); and

a tile insertion module for revealing a tile corresponding to the application upon minimization (e.g., see Fig. 4).

Amro further teaches providing access to one or more application features through the tile (e.g., providing access to application A's menu bar and toolbar, see Fig. 6). However, Amro does not expressly teach displaying the selected interactive features in the tile in response to minimization.

Straub, though, teaches a sidebar having a plurality of tiles for displaying a plurality of interactive information (e.g., items 156, 158, 160 in a channel bar 144 as shown in Fig. 5) and displaying one or more interactive features of the minimized application in the tile (e.g., note that the tile comprising interactive information such as buttons 156, 158, 160 as shown in Fig. 5 and col. 8 lines 15-67). Thus, combining Amro and Straub would meet the claimed limitations for the same reasons as discussed with respect to claim 1 above.

As to claim 2, Straub further teaches wherein the one or more interactive application features include a sub-set of the original application features (e.g., see sidebar 144 as shown in Fig. 5). Thus, combining Amro and Straub would meet the claimed limitations for the same reasons as discussed with respect to claim 1 above.

As to claim 3, Amro further teaches all of the original application features can be available through the tile (e.g., a user can access to all features of application A by clicking on the tile 'Application A', see Fig. 4). Amro does not teach displaying all of the original application features. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skill in the art at the time the invention

Art Unit: 2179

was made to implement this limitation to provide a user with instant access to some of the most important daily information (e.g., see sidebar103 page 1, paragraph 2).

As to claims 4 and 15, Amro teaches further comprising providing, in the tile, access to additional features not available in the application (e.g., providing a feature of restoring a minimized application, see Fig. 6).

As to claims 5 and 17, Amro teaches further comprising hiding an application window upon receiving the minimize command (e.g., hiding windows application A and B, see Fig. 5).

As to claims 6 and 18, Straub further teaches hiding a taskbar application button associated with the application upon receiving the minimized command (e.g., see Fig. 5). Thus, combining Amro and Straub would meet the claimed limitations for the same reasons as discussed with respect to claim 1 above.

As to claims 9, 20, 30, and 36, Amro teaches comprising providing access to the subset of application features through a fly-out menu accessible through the tile / displayed in the tile (e.g., see Fig. 6).

As to claims 10, 21, 26 and 33, Amro teaches comprising providing the user with a restore button accessible through the tile to allow the user to maximize the application (e.g., see col. 7 lines 1-15 and step 206 in Fig. 8).

As to claims 11, 22 and 27, Straub teaches providing an available features selection module for allowing selection of the one or more interactive features for display in and accessibility through the tile (e.g., see Fig. 5). Thus, combining Amro and Straub would meet the claimed limitations for the same reasons as discussed with respect to claim 1 above.

As to claim 13, Amro further teaches a computer storage medium having computer executable instructions for performing the method of claim 1 (e.g., see col. 9 lines 59-67).

As to claim 16, Amro teaches further comprising inserting a tile in the sidebar for providing access to the application (e.g., see Fig. 6).

As to claims 28 and 34, Amro teaches further comprising special controls for allowing removal of the application from the sidebar (e.g., see col. 5 lines 62-67 through col. 6 lines 1-3).

As to claim 32, Amro teaches wherein the tile insertion module reveals a tile in a desktop bar configured to host the tile within the user interface, wherein the desktop bar includes a plurality of tiles corresponding to a plurality of applications (e.g., active application bar 106 having application A-B tiles in Fig. 5). Straub teaches a sidebar (e.g., see Fig. 5). Thus, combining Amro and Straub would meet the claimed limitations for the same reasons as discussed with respect to claim 1 above.

17. Claims 12, 23 and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Amro in view of Straub further in view of Oran et al (Patent No 5757371, hereinafter Oran).

As to claims 12 and 23, Amro and Straub teach the limitation of claims 2 and 16 for the reasons as discussed with respect to claims 2 and 16 above. However, Amro and Straub fail to expressly teach allowing a user to determine a size of the tile. Oran, though, teaches allowing the user to determine a size of the tile (e.g., see Fig. 10A).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined the feature of allowing a user to determine a size of the tile as taught

Art Unit: 2179

by Oran to the sidebar as taught by Amro and Straub to achieve the claimed invention. The motivation for the combination is to provide a user the ability to resize tiles and thus displaying further information about the tiles.

As to claim 24, Amro further teaches a computer storage medium having computer executable instructions for performing the method of claim 12 (e.g., see col. 9 lines 59-67).

18. Claims 7, 19, 29 and 35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Amro in view of Straub further in view of Kramer et al (Patent No US 6738810 B1, hereinafter Kramer).

As to claims 7 and 19, Amro and Straub teach the limitation of claims 1 and 14 for the reasons as discussed with respect to claims 1 and 14 above. However, Amro and Straub fail to expressly teach hiding an alt-tab entry associated with the application. Kramer, though, teaches hiding an alt-tab entry associated with the application (e.g., see col. 7 lines 19-36).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined the two teachings together to automatically hide the alt-tab entry associated with the application upon receiving the minimized command because features associated with the application is now available through the tile in the sidebar; therefore, disabling or hiding the alt-tab entry would save memory and thus speed up processing time.

As to claims 29 and 35, Amro further teaches hiding an application window upon receiving the minimize command (e.g., hiding windows application A and B, see Fig. 5). Straub further teaches hiding a taskbar application button associated with the application upon receiving the minimized command (e.g., see Fig. 5).

Art Unit: 2179

However, Amro and Straub do not teach hiding an alt-tab entry associated with the application. Kramer, though, teaches hiding an alt-tab entry associated with the application (e.g., see col. 7 lines 19-36). Thus, combining Amro, Straub, and Kramer would meet the limitations for the same reasons as discussed with respect to claims 7 and 19 above.

Response to Arguments

19. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-7 and 9-36 filed on 6/21/07 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

It is noted that any citation to specific, pages, columns, lines, or figures in the prior art references and any interpretation of the references should not be considered to be limiting in any way. A reference is relevant for all it contains and may be relied upon for all that it would have reasonably suggested to one

Art Unit: 2179

having ordinary skill in the art. In re Heck, 699 F.2d 1331, 1332-33, 216 USPQ 1038, 1039 (Fed. Cir. 1983) (quoting In re Lemelson, 397 F.2d 1006, 1009, 158 USPQ 275, 277 (CCPA 1968)).


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to TuyetLien (Lien) T. Tran whose telephone number is 571-270-1033. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Friday: 7:30 - 5:00 (every other Friday off).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Weilun Lo can be reached on 571-272-4847. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

T.T
8/17/2007

Lien Tran
Examiner
Art Unit 2179


BAHUYNH
PRIMARY EXAMINER